

R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

RE: THE SPECIFICATION

The Examiner asserts that "FIG. 8" should be "FIG. 9" at page 18, lines 11 and 16.

Although the paragraph at page 18, lines 7-16, discusses steps shown in FIG. 9, the phrases "the internet downloaded information shown in FIG. 8" and "the internet download information shown in FIG. 8" refer to the internet download information. As recognized by the Examiner, the internet download[ed] information is shown in the conceptual diagram of FIG. 8, as recognized by the Examiner on page 2 of the Office Action. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the references to FIG. 8 are correct.

RE: THE CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the image pickup unit is configured to pick up a plurality of images of at least one object, and to clarify that the image storage unit stores image files corresponding to the image, and that the address storage unit stores a plurality of addresses corresponding to a plurality of information files, to better accord with the

disclosure in the specification of the JPEG (image) files and the HTML (information) files designated by the URLs (addresses).

Claim 7 has been amended to delete the "reading" step thereof, as well as to avoid unnecessarily reciting a plurality of addresses. Claim 7 recites, in particular, connecting an image pickup device through a network to a site designated by an address stored in a memory of the image pickup device, said address being stored in advance by a user. Claim 7 has also been amended to refer to an image file and an information file.

Claim 13 has been amended to recite an "address" to avoid unnecessarily reciting a plurality of addresses, as well as to recite an image data "file" and an information "file" and to make an additional minor clarifying amendment by moving the phrase "when the image recording unit records the image data file."

Claim 16 has been amended to recite image data "files" and information "files," as well as to recite a plurality of server units.

Each of independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 16, moreover, has been amended to emphasize that the address or addresses (from which an information file/s is/are downloaded) is set by a user in advance.

Finally, claims 2, 4, 5, 8-12, 14, 15 and 17-19 have been amended to better accord with their respective amended parent claims.

No new matter has been added, and it is respectfully requested that the amendments to the claims be approved and entered. It is respectfully submitted, moreover, that the amendments to the claims do not narrow the scope of the claims, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

RE: THE EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner acknowledges that all of the claim language except for the recitation of "a plurality of addresses set by a user in advance" is supported by the original disclosure.

The Examiner asserts that the disclosure in the specification at page 17, lines 4-7 requires information to be downloaded from the Internet and then set up preliminarily by a user. It is respectfully pointed out, however, that the specification discloses at page 17, lines 10-13 that a plurality of URLs (addresses) are set up, and that the download time interval of each can be set up, to determine information to be downloaded. In addition, it is respectfully pointed out that the specification discloses at page 25, line 19 to page 26, line 2 that a list of specified sites (the list containing a number of URLs) is set up. According to page 25, line 27 to page 26, line 2, the "specified site list is registered beforehand in the digital still camera 103 by a user and stored in the flash

memory 18" (emphasis added). In view of this disclosure, it is respectfully submitted that the original specification clearly supports setting up a plurality of addresses (e.g., URLs) in advance by a user.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are fully supported by the original disclosure, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 USC 112 be withdrawn.

* * * * *

Entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Holtz/

Douglas Holtz
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.
220 Fifth Avenue - 16th Floor
New York, New York 10001-7708
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
DH:iv